

Date: Tue, 23 Aug 94 13:01:02 PDT
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V94 #952
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest Tue, 23 Aug 94 Volume 94 : Issue 952

Today's Topics:

 CQ/Ham Radio Magazine history
 Doc's Heathkit SB-230 anyone?
 DSP12 and ICOM 275/475
 FLAME the FCC
 HELP! HOW TO IMPROV
 learning CW (2 msgs)
 Need QSL database address (auto responder!)
 Poor audio fix for HT's.
 Questions: Digital S
 Radio Interface to Internet?
 Which group for BBC?

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Tue, 23 Aug 1994 07:46:36 -0400
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!news.ecn.bgu.edu!psuvax1!
news.pop.psu.edu!news.cac.psu.edu!newsserver.jvnc.net!rohvm1!
roh033.mah48d@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: CQ/Ham Radio Magazine history
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1994Aug22.084306.33056@leo.bsuvc.bsu.edu>,
00tlzivney@bsuvc.bsu.edu (Terry L. Zivney) wrote:

>

> Gary is not quite accurate about CQ buying Ham Radio magazine to

> temporarily boost their circulation by adding the HR subscribers -
> I had a lifetime subscription to Ham Radio and received NO additional
> issues of CQ - the publisher told me I should have purchased the
> lifetime subscription to CQ (this at the Atlanta hamfest a few years
> back).

Well, I got the last two years of my 3-year HR subscription as CQ. It was the last time I ever took an extended subscription to anything. I had read CQ a couple of times back in the '50's, and decided it was too puerile for my (then) teen-age sensibilities. I noticed, when I got the two years of subscription from them, that they had improved a bit over the last 35 years, but not enough to justify the price of their subscription.

I suspect Gary is right that the circulation boost would have been temporary, because I couldn't imagine a more incompatible readership than the techies of HR and the contesters of CQ. They gave some lip service about putting technical articles into CQ, but they never did (and I hope you don't call the drivel they do publish, "technical").

--

John Taylor (W3ZID) | "The opinions expressed are those of the
roh033.mah48d@rohmmaas.com | writer and not of Rohm and Haas Company."

Date: 23 Aug 1994 09:54:39 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!EU.net!sun4n1!
news.nic.surfnet.nl!tuegate.tue.nl!blade.stack.urc.tue.nl!robs@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Doc's Heathkit SB-230 anyone?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Hello fellow amateurs.

A friend of mine, PDOMHS, is compiling a set of documents for a new clubstation being set up in Hungary. There is not much available over there. For that reason, some Dutch amateurs are assisting as much as they can. One of the items requested is the documentation set for the SB-230.

This item is rare in Holland, because the SB-230 does not conform norms set by the Dutch equivalent of the FCC, the HDTP.

If anyone has such a doc, and is willing to send a photocopy in the aid of our Hungarian fellows, please mail your intention to me. If more people apply, I will select the shortest surface mail path, en mail the address to wich the docs may be posted.

I thank everybody in advance for the effort of reading this posting, and perhaps for willing to help.

73,
Rob, PA3AXI

e-mail: robs@stack.urc.tue.nl

PA3AXI

AMPRNET addres: temporarily defunct.

Date: 23 Aug 94 17:46:55 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: DSP12 and ICOM 275/475
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Hello Elmers,
Does someone know correct wiring for Up/Down control between
DSP12 and Icom's 275/475 for pacsat use ?

Does anyone know TX input in IC275/475 for 9600 FSK from DSP12 ?
How to wire it ?

If you use DSP12 or even DSP2232/1232, would you tell me your comments
on pacsat (both 1200PSK and 9600 FSK) ? Do you think DSP will
handle SSTV/Wefax/APT/G-TOR well ?

Please return to A8LJSJU@SJUMUSIC.STJOHNS.EDU
saying Samuel.
Thank you.

de Sam/N2TAX
Aug 23 17:46 UTC

Date: 23 Aug 1994 14:07:34 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!news.umbc.edu!
haven.umd.edu!cville-srv.wam.umd.edu!ham@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: FLAME the FCC
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

>..My son and I took our no code tech exam on MAY 15 this year. My son
>..is 17 years and was all hyped up about the exam. He wanted to pass
>..badly. Well, he did, he passed both parts with 100%. I did not as
>..but passed anyway.
>
>..Now, 14 weeks later we still do not have our licenses. Vacation passed
>..where we could have used our radios, other times passed, but still no
>..license. A call to the ARRL only confirmed that they sent the results
>..to the FCC. Otherwise they do not do anything for your dues.
>
>..What is taking the FCC so long? Anyone else any good ideas to fire up
>..some action from those lazy bastards? But like they say, government

>..workers (an oxymoron) are the lowest of all.

>

>Have you by chance called the FCC license bureau in Gettysburg, Penn. The
>number is 1-717-337-1212. Maybe there was a mistake. And, what did you
>expect the ARRL to do?

>

Actually, I have no doubt that the papers got to the FCC in good time.
Then they got put into a big room with boxes and boxes of 610's waiting
to get processed. The FCC's new computer is on line with 5 or 6 terminals
available but only 1 person to run ham licenses, 1 day a week. And for
every phone call they get, a license or two doesn't get processed.

Yes, they're slow. Also true, the gov't gets no money from amateur
licensing. In Canada, it's something like \$25/year to keep your ticket.
Licenses get processed quickly, and appropriately so. But if you think
that charging for amateur licensing will make a difference, THINK
AGAIN.

All that money goes into a big pool. Yes, it SHOULD go to the licen-
sing bureau, but it wouldn't. It just doesn't work that way.

Actually, last June (1993) when the question pool changed, the delay
went from 6 weeks to upwards of 12 weeks, Why? All of those people
who had bought the study books realized that the questions would
be invalid after June 30! Everybody rushed to take their exams,
flooding the FCC with Form 610s!

Then people asked, rather upset, "Why is this taking so damned long?
What's going on up there?" when in effect it was the fault of every
ham who waited to take his/her exam until the last possible week.

The backlog will improve - and electronic license submission can't
be far away, although that's no consolation to you who have to wait
now. Use the time to study more elements, or to learn the code.
I know of people who took the Tech exams and by the time the Tech
ticket arrived, they held credit for Advanced and Extra class lic-
enses!

--

73,

----- The
 \ / Long Original

Scott Rosenfeld Amateur Radio NF3I Burtonsville, MD | Live \$5.00
WAC-CW/SSB WAS DXCC - 130 QSLed on dipoles -----| Dipoles! Antenna!

Date: Tue, 23 Aug 1994 03:52:13 GMT

From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!swrinde!howland.reston.ans.net!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!
usenet.ucs.indiana.edu!battin@ames.arpa
Subject: HELP! HOW TO IMPROV
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1994Aug19.135216.3532@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, Gary Coffman
(gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us) wrote:

> In article <Cuq5pC.7xq@usenet.ucs.indiana.edu> battin@cyclops.iucf.indiana.edu
(Laurence Gene Battin) writes:

> >

> >The method of passing the test by transcribing the dots and dashes and
> >then transliterating them into letters during the time allotted for
> >"correcting" your text is specifically recommended by Wayne Green in
> >one of his editorials this year. I don't have the issue handy, but it
> >was sometime around May or June. I don't see anything wrong with using
> >this technique, if possible, during an actual QSO, but it certainly
> >seems to me to be wrong to do so during the exam. The reason I think
> >this method is cheating is not because I'm a priori against any particular
> >means of getting the correct answer onto paper. Rather, it seems to me
> >that this method depends implicitly on misusing that portion of the
> >exam time which is supposed to be used for correcting relatively straight-
> >forward errors, and, IMHO, not to be used to perform some intermediate
> >transliteration step.

> I agree that using this method to achieve 1 minute solid copy is not
> exactly in step with the intent of the test. However, just sight reading
> your copy in order to answer the multiple choice questions seems to me
> to be a different matter. You put the information down in a form readable
> by you solely in order to answer questions about the content of the
> text. There's no reason your **notes** have to be readable by anyone
> else.

Well, there might be, if someone claimed that your **notes** were just a
transcription of the dots and dashes, and that you weren't actually decoding
the morse until the question answering part of the test. Why limit yourself
to pencil and paper? Why not just tape the test, and then play it back
slowly when answering the questions?

> My shorthand copy doesn't **look** like conventional dots and dashes.
> I doubt anyone else could make heads or tails of it. The same could be
> said for some people's handwriting. :-)

I still think that it is too easy to use this reasoning as an excuse to cover
not being able to decode morse at the speed the test is meant to examine.
And, no matter what certain magazine publishers might recommend, my sense of
honor would forbid me to make use of such devices.

As far as I'm concerned, there is a line somewhere between using pencil and

paper to form an intermediate storage step in `_decoding_ morse`, and using it to form an intermediate step in `_storing_` the decoded material before answering test questions. On one side, IMHO, is cheating, and on the other is "shorthand".

How to tell when such a line is crossed, is, the more I think on it, not so easy. Perhaps, if I were King, I'd let people use only a common, previously known form of shorthand for transcribing their test reception, and declare that any `_privately_` defined shorthand is not allowed. It wouldn't be the first time that a perfectly good way of doing something was banned because of the existence of those who would use it to cheat, and one could not validly then say that I was denying the benefits of shorthand from those who would choose to employ it: if they want to use shorthand, fine, they can use a recognized form that we know is `_not_` designed as a disguised attempt to just transcribe the dots and dashes.

Unfortunately, I'm not King.

> If it's allowed to copy `*in your head*` in order to answer the exam
> questions, and it is, then there's no reason to forbid a pencil and
> paper aid of whatever form for the same purpose.

Well, I'm trying to show you that, IMHO, there `_is_` a reason to do just that. The difference is that few, if any, copy code in their head by memorizing the entire 5 minute exam `*in dots and dashes*` and then proceed to leisurely decode it during the question period, but there are `*plenty*` of ways to do this with pencil and paper, and, again, as far as I'm concerned, that is cheating. So, I think your analogy simply fails.

> The important thing
> you're supposed to show is that you recovered the `*content*` of the
> text sufficiently well to answer the questions without the aid of
> a machine, IE you're supposed to `*emulate*` a machine for the purposes
> of the test.

Let me word my opposing viewpoint in your language:

You are supposed to do the machine emulation `*during*` the 5-minute transmission of the exam, not during the ensuing test to see if your machine emulation was flawed. Do you see what I'm saying now?

Of course, we can simply agree to disagree, but somehow I feel that my view is more nearly representative of the spirit of the regulation.

And, if you adhere to that honorably, and pass the morse exam, you can justifiably feel like you've accomplished something with pride.

Of course, feeling pride in one's accomplishments is rather old-fashioned these days.

> No one is concerned about the internal intermediate
> steps taken by a machine, so no one should be concerned about the
> intermediate steps you take emulating a machine.

..**During** the time allotted for you to be emulating the machine.

That time ends after the first 5 minutes. I agree that, during that phase, no one should, and no one acutally does care whether you're doing it via cute mnemonic phrases, a sense of rythmn, or by seeing dots and dashes in your head, or whatever.

> All that should
> matter is whether the **content** is output successfully.

Well, that really isn't true, otherwise my repeated example of using a tape recorder to help you in the process **ought** to be allowed.

What actually matters is that we try to test people in a way that satisfies the F.C.C. And I think they would prefer that you demonstrate that you can decode morse at essentially the rate it is sent, not que it up to accomodate a significantly slower decoding speed. Suppose they decide that they are going to reexamine you? (Correct me if I'm wrong, but they can do this, can't they? Particularly if they suspect there was some sort of "funny business" going on when you were examined, right?) Do you think you'd still pass? This is an honest question. Surely there is in the history of the F.C.C. some indication of their opinions in this matter.

I was going to follow this with a soapbox discussion of why I think that Mr. Green's attitude was equivalent to the philosophy that one should disobey even trivial laws that one finds fault with, and how such narrow-minded and ultimately asocial attitudes were behind some of the major problems facing America today, but decided that it wasn't worth it. He's nowhere near as dangerous as the Ollie Norths of the world.

--

Gene Battin, N9XAM
battin@iucf.indiana.edu

Date: 23 Aug 1994 10:53:56 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!
uhog.mit.edu!news.kei.com!eff!cs.umd.edu!news.coop.net!news.den.mmc.com!
iplmail.orl.mmc.com!mccartney!jcarter@network
Subject: Learning CW
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

CODE ON THE VERGE OF EXTINCTION? - At a June meeting of the ARRL and its counterparts from Germany and Japan, the subject of elimination of Morse Code as a requirement for licensing below 30 MHz came up. New Zealand and some European countries are in favor of it, but the ARRL maintains strong support

for continuing Morse Code as a requirement, both domestically and internationally.

From: VARA NEWSLETTER August 1994

0 0 000 0 0 000 00 0 0	James A. Carter	Jcarter@orl.mmc.com
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	FCC Lic. KD4PON	These views are my own and
00 0 0 0000 000 0 0 0 00	1-(407)356-5879	are in no way connected
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 00	Martin Mariettia	to MARTIN MARIETTIA.
0 0 000 0 0 00 0 0	Orlando, FL 32855	Thanks Jim

Date: Tue, 23 Aug 1994 02:14:54 GMT

From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!newsfeed.ksu.ksu.edu!

moe.ksu.ksu.edu!osuunx.ucc.okstate.edu!olesun!gcouger@ames.arpa

Subject: learning CW

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <33b41v\$3km@mrnews.mro.dec.com>,
Tom Randolph <randolph@est.enet.dec.com> wrote:

>

>In article <3397dj\$rsb@geraldo.cc.utexas.edu>, oo7@astro.as.utexas.edu (Derek Wills) writes...

>>I'm curious to know whether those who learn it from computer programs
>>that send perfect code in a quiet room find it a shock once they get
>>on the air and have to contend with real people sending code, fading
>>signals, QRM, all that stuff? Is it easy to make the transition to
>>the real world?

>

Most of the hams that I test never use the code on the air. They learn it on the computer and never use it on the air. I have heard some of them complain that it was difficult to switch from the keyboard to a pencil & paper. I would let anyone test on a computer that wanted too.

I got up to 5 words a minute on the computer and went the rest of the way on the air. Copying one strong clear signal was easy compared to 20 meters. I feel that I could have learned the code faster with a computer but it wouldn't have been as much fun.

>Copying strictly over-the-air QSOs gets you good at copying over-the-air QSOs, >which might make it hard on you if the VE decides to test you with plain text >out of a magazine or some such... Fortunately, most don't.

>

All the testing teams I know of use the test that are supplied with the materials.

Gordon AB5Dg

Gordon Couger

Biosystems & Agricultural Engineering
Oklahoma State University
114 Ag Hall, Stillwater, OK 74074
gcouger@olesun.agen.okstate.edu 405-744-9763 day 624-2855 evenings
I do not speak for my employer

Date: Mon, 22 Aug 1994 22:22:05 GMT
From: ncrigw2.ncr.com!ncrhub2!ncrcae!news@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Need QSL database address (auto responder!)
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I have lost (well, actually, my mail was destroyed by 2 incompetents but I'll leave it at that) the address for the automated QSL database in Europe. All you have to do is email the callsign of the station for which you need the manager, and you will receive an email back with the info. I have only used it a couple of times, but it is awesome. Both times I got an answer within 2 or 3 hourss.

Now that I've introduced this server....does anyone have the address? I believe it was in Germany but I can't swear to it. Thanks in advance!

73, Tom WB4iUX (Tom.Skelton@ClemsonSC.NCR.COM 'regardless of what your header says')

73, Tom WB4iUX
My posting is my view only and not AT&T's. But you know that!
DX IS !!!!!
And always will be.....

Date: 23 Aug 94 10:19:33 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: Poor audio fix for HT's.
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Hello everyone:

A common complaint about the newer micro handhelds is the low volume audio. There is a fix to that problem, which I have applied to my Kenwood TH-78A. I use a CD Player-to-Cassette adapter (Radio Shack 12-1951), it plugs into

the headphone jack of the HT and the adapter loads like a cassette into the car stereo system. With this setup one hears the HT audio amplified by the car stereo, so there is plenty of power available. Also, it is possible to modify audio tone with the stereo controls.

73 de XE1RGL.

```
=====
Guillermo Gosset, XE1RGL
Instituto de Biotecnologia/U.N.A.M.  email: gosset@132.248.32.1
Cuernavaca, Mexico.                  xe1rgl@amsat.org
=====
```

```
-----
Date: Tue, 23 Aug 94 00:31:00 -0400
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!swrinde!emory!metro.atlanta.com!mhv.net!
news.sprintlink.net!coyote.channel1.com!channel1!alan.wilensky@ames.arpa
Subject: Questions: Digital S
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu
```

```
DH> Cellphones, Transmissions
DH>Message-ID: <33aqf0$gss@eugene.convex.com>
DH>Newsgroups:
DH>rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy
DH>Organization: CONVEX Computer Corporation, Richardson, TX USA
DH>In <1994Aug20.140335.9766@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary
DH>Coffman) writes:
```

```
DH>>There are two methods competing for digital cellular. One is based
DH>>on TDMA, and the other is spread spectrum. Since with SS each phone
DH>will >have it's own spreading sequence keyed to it's serial number,
DH>you'd have >to try millions of combinations to luck onto the correct
DH>one for a given >phone. If TDMA is chosen, you'll have to break the
DH>supervisory circuit to >track the time slice as the phone hops from
DH>cell to cell. And all of this >would be very illegal of course.
```

```
DH>>Gary
```

```
DH>Wouldn't SS be a pain to orchestrate being that cell sites use
DH>specific frequencies per site or am I missing something here? Are
DH>the digital phones going to use the same freq spectrum? (~824-849)
```

```
DH>David
```

The other competitor to TDMA is CDMA, a code division scheme that is SS, but is somewhat band width constrained in the form used for cellular phones. The system is owned outright, patents and all, by one company

called Qualcomm, Inc. They are the largest provider of truck tracking satellite systems and services.

There are certain subtle but important differences between CDMA and SS as used in the classical sense.

Alan Wilensky, N1SS0
abm@world.std.com

≥ CmpQwk #UNREG≥ UNREGISTERED EVALUATION COPY

Date: Tue, 23 Aug 1994 04:25:48 GMT
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!usc!nic-nac.CSU.net!charnel.ecst.csuchico.edu!csusac!
csus.edu!netcom.com!nuke@ames.arpa
Subject: Radio Interface to Internet?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <sethrCux0F9.1B2@netcom.com>, Seth Russell <sethr@netcom.com> wrote:
>Ok this might be a really dumb question - but I am going to ask it anyway.

I don't think it's so dumb--I've certainly pondered it on occasion.

>If one needed to download truly large files from the Internet (say in the
>range of 100 files of 50 megs each every day) - then the first thing that
>jumps to mind is - direct connect and bring in a T1 trunk from the *phone
>company* and lease it for about \$900 per month - right?

Cor, that's a lot of bandwidth. 5 gig/day? T1 gets you 13 gig/day, no
compression. If you could stand 1 gig/day, you could go ISDN; I'm told
here in the south bay ISDN connections are \$70 to install and
\$28/month. Excluding equipment costs (still not really all that
much--cheaper than a T1 rig) that's pretty hard to beat.

>Is this actually the most economical way to do it? Couldn't an enterprising
>network provider who is already hooked up to the net just interface with a
>radio transmitter that could put data on the air waves and allow anyone with a
>receiver/modem to pick it up for the cost of the equipment and the cost
>to the network provider? Hey I told you it was a dumb question before
>you started reading!

I don't know the rules for that part of the service well enough to
give an authoritative answer, but I bet you'd have problems getting an
appropriate license. Having a "downlink" independent of (any) "uplink"
seems weird to me somehow, but perhaps I'm just used to copper.

I hope someone out there can give a more definitive answer. Part 73 I

know (sorta mostly); the rest is pretty shaky!

Bill ke6jnr

--

Bill Newcomb "Most of what I've learned over the years has
nuke@netcom.com come from signatures." -Larry Wall

Date: Tue, 23 Aug 1994 11:43:34 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!pipex!bbc!ant!
boyer@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Which group for BBC?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Patrick Connolly (connolly@honey.isor.vuw.ac.nz) wrote:

: Apologies in advance if this is the wrong group, but.....

: I am trying to find the e-mail address for the BBC. This seems
: to be the most appropriate group, but it's not quite it.

: If anyone knows, I'd be grateful. I'll even accept abuse for
: using the wrong group if you can tell me where I should have
: looked,

: Ta,

: Patrick

Who do you want in the beeb?

john B

Date: Tue, 23 Aug 1994 04:04:47 GMT
From: agate!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!MathWorks.Com!
yeshua.marcam.com!charnel.ecst.csuchico.edu!csusac!csus.edu!netcom.com!
nuke@ames.arpa
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <300@coutts.UUCP>, <barry.187.00154D86@indirect.com>, <33astc\$415@111-winken.llnl.gov>shua.mar
Subject : Re: XYL Reactions (snicker- Kodak moment) (was Re: IC-751A HF Transceiver)

In article <33astc\$415@lll-winken.llnl.gov>,
Steve Hunter 510-423-2219 <hunter@s07.es.llnl.gov> wrote:
>I would be very hesitant to put any electronic equipment in a dishwasher. Don't
forget that
>it is assembled with lead solder. I imagine that you will end up with measurable
amounts of
>lead on your next load of dishes.

I bet you a dozen doughnuts you end up with measureable amounts of
lead on every load of dishes you do. Lead is detectable down into the
ppt range.

The neutral-to-slightly-alkaline water produced by most dish
detergents shouldn't leach much lead at all from solder, not even the
cruddy 40/60 SnPb stuff. That which does come out will be thoroughly
washed away.

In short, don't lose any sleep. If you are paranoid, one empty-unit
cycle should wash it all away.

Bill ke6jnr

--

Bill Newcomb "Most of what I've learned over the years has
nuke@netcom.com come from signatures." -Larry Wall

End of Info-Hams Digest V94 #952
